

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

April 11, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Stewart Straus called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Stewart Straus; Board Members Cecilia Antonio, Hal Beighley, Monty Edberg, Ron Nardoza and Jennifer Shipley. Board Member Mimi Doukas was excused.

Senior Planner Colin Cooper, Assistant Planner Jeff Caines and Assistant Planner Leigh Crabtree represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Straus read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

NEW BUSINESS:

Senior Planner Colin Cooper introduced himself, Assistant Planner Leigh Crabtree and Assistant Planner Jeff Caines, observing that they would be presenting the Staff Reports for both applications, including VAR 2002-0001 – Hearthstone at Murrayhill Carport Variance and BDR 2001-0206 – 167th Place Office Building Design Review.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Straus opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the hearing. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda.

A. **VAR 2002-0001 - HEARTHSTONE AT MURRAYHILL CARPORT VARIANCE**

This land use application has been submitted requesting a Design Variance to reduce the side yard setback to zero feet from the 10 foot standard of the City's Development Code pursuant to Section 20.05.50.3.B. The purpose of the proposed variance is to allow future construction of carports along the northern property line of the subject site. The development proposal, generally located north of SW Scholls Ferry Road and east of SW Davies Road, is addressed at 10880 SW Davies Road; Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-33BD, on Tax Lot 04700. The site is zoned Urban Medium Density (R2) and is approximately 5.29 acres in size. In taking action on the proposed development, the Board of Design Review shall base their decisions on the approval criteria listed in Section 40.80.15.3.C of the City of Beaverton's Development Code.

On behalf of Associate Planner Scott Whyte, Assistant Planner Leigh Crabtree presented the Staff Report and briefly described the details with regard to this request for a Design Variance for a reduction of the side yard setback from the ten foot standard required in the R-2 zoning district to zero feet in order to allow for the future construction of carports along the northern property line of the subject site. Referring to page 8 of the Staff Report, she pointed out that line 2 should be amended, as follows: "...the site where the applicant proposes to construct ~~three~~ **five** carport structures that will..." Concluding, she recommended approval of the application, with certain Conditions of Approval, and offered to respond to questions.

On question, Ms. Crabtree confirmed Chairman Straus' observation that this request for a Variance is due to the small section of the adjoining property that intrudes into the middle of this development and that only the first four of the carports to the east is actually subject to the Variance. She clarified that an application for an administrative Design Review would be submitted for the construction of the carports, adding that this application involves a moderate modification to the subject site, pending approval of this Variance.

APPLICANT:

WALTER FRIESEN, on behalf of the applicant, Hearthstone at Murrayhill, expressed his opinion that staff had adequately covered the details of this simple proposal and offered to respond to questions.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no member of the public testified with regard to this application.

On question, staff had no further comments with regard to this proposal.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Ms. Antonio **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of VAR 2002-0001 – Hearthstone at Murrayhill Carport Variance, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated April 4, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 3.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

B. BDR 2001-0206 - 167TH PLACE OFFICE BUILDING

The applicant requests Design Review approval for the construction of a one-story brick office building at the northern terminus of NW 167th Place, north of NW Cornell Road, south of Highway 26, and west of NW Bethany Boulevard. The Board of Design Review will review the overall design of this request including buildings, landscaping, parking, and lighting design. In taking action on the proposed development, the Board shall base its decision on the approval criteria listed in Section 40.10.15.3.C. The development proposal is located at 1961 NW 167th Place; Washington County Assessor's Map 1N1-31AA on Tax Lot 900. The affected parcel is zoned Office Commercial (OC) and is approximately 1.20 acres in size.

Ms. Crabtree presented the Staff Report and briefly discussed this request for Design Review approval for the construction of a one-story brick office building at 1967 NW 167th Place. She mentioned a correction to page 5 of the Staff Report, with regard to Existing Land Uses: Surrounding area, as follows:

East: ~~Mini-Storage Units.~~ **Medical Office Building.**

West: ~~Medical Office Building.~~ **Mini-Storage Units.**

Ms. Crabtree pointed out that due to the speculative nature of this proposal, the proposed motor vehicle parking analysis and proposed bicycle parking analysis had been prepared for a 50/50 split of the tenant space for offices and financial institutions. She noted that this proposed motor vehicle parking analysis had not included an additional option considered by the applicant, specifically office and medical 50/50 split, and briefly described the implications of this option, adding that there had been no changes to the proposed bicycle parking analysis. She provided additional details with regard to this application, including the location, zoning, and access of the property, observing that no known historical or natural resources are located on or near the site.

Assistant Planner Jeff Caines discussed the details with regard to the location of the site and the applicant's proposal, including provisions for vehicle parking, bicycle parking, illumination, and landscaping. He described the geographical features of the site and the visual features of the proposed structure, including color, accents, windows and materials. Concluding, he pointed out that staff has determined that the application meets applicable criteria and recommended

approval, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 3, and offered to respond to questions.

APPLICANT:

CHRIS WILLIAMS, representing *David Bisset & Associates*, expressed his opinion that staff had thoroughly described this project, emphasizing that the applicant has attempted to create what he referred to as a “Class A” office environment. Observing that the building has been designed particularly to attract a certain type of tenant, primarily office, financial and some medical uses. He described the materials proposed for the building, noting that the maintenance would be simplified by the use of durable, yet attractive materials. Concluding, he discussed the extensive landscaping and offered to respond to questions.

Referring to the proposed landscaping, Ms. Antonio mentioned trees on the eastern property line, specifically one that appears to extend into an adjacent property.

Mr. Williams requested clarification of whether she is indicating that the tree canopy extends onto the adjacent property.

Ms. Antonio expressed her opinion that the actual tree appears to be planted on the adjacent property.

Mr. Williams pointed out that the landscape architect had been attempting to create a link between the old and new buildings, as well as providing a place for the tenants of both buildings to have lunch or even informal meetings, when possible. Observing that the applicant owns both buildings and is supportive of the idea of linking the buildings, he noted that allowing the trees to provide this connection between the buildings would provide a _____ quality to this outside space. On question, he pointed out that the two rectangles located on the illustration represent existing utilities for the old building, rather than tables. He mentioned that the trash has been moved from the current location at the existing building to the other end of the site.

Ms. Crabtree clarified that the off-site improvements that have been conditioned as a Type 1 Design Review, specifically the bridging of the landscaping, are not actually included with this particular application, adding that this would be addressed through a Type 1 Design Review application in the future.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no member of the public testified with regard to this application.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Ms. Antonio **SECONDED** a motion for the approval of BDR 2001-0206 – 167th Place Office Building Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearings on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated April 4, 2002, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 through 20.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of February 28, 2002, as written, were submitted. Chairman Straus asked if there were any changes or corrections. Ms. Shipley requested that paragraph 8 of page 19 be amended, as follows: “Referring to Criterion “G”, Ms. ~~Antonio~~ **Shipley** mentioned that...”; that paragraph 11 of page 19 be amended, as follows: “Ms. ~~Antonio~~ **Shipley** referred to Criterion “F”...”; that paragraph 6 of page 20 be amended, as follows: “Ms. ~~Antonio~~ **Shipley** referred to the cars that have already entered the Brinkley’s yard...”; that paragraph 2 of page 27 be amended, as follows: “Ms. ~~Antonio~~ **Shipley** requested clarification...”; and that paragraph 6 of page 27 be amended, as follows: “Ms. ~~Antonio~~ **Shipley** expressed concern...” Mr. Beighley **MOVED** and Ms. Shipley **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as amended.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Mr. Edberg, who **ABSTAINED** from voting on this issue.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

Observing that his work schedule with regard to travel is not allowing him to participate on the Board of Design Review at a level he finds acceptable, Mr. Edberg regretfully informed the Board that he intends to tender his resignation to Mayor Drake next week.

Chairman Straus advised Mr. Edberg that he would be required to find a replacement prior to resigning.

Mr. Edberg pointed out that in an effort to make this transition less difficult, he is willing to participate as much as possible without interfering with his work schedule.

Chairman Straus expressed his appreciation of Mr. Edberg’s efforts on behalf of the Board, observing that depending on a wide variety of issues, including work and family, lapses in attendance are sometimes unavoidable. Pointing out that it has been difficult to find members of the community to serve in this capacity, he urged Mr. Edberg to reconsider submitting his resignation, unless it appears that he would be unavailable more often than he would attend.

Noting that he does not anticipate any change in his work schedule for the next six months, Mr. Edberg assured Chairman Straus that he would be happy to continue to serve to the extent that his work schedule allows.

Chairman Straus pointed out that Mr. Edberg might know an individual who would be willing to serve in this capacity.

Mr. Beighley suggested that Henry Kane would like to serve on the Board of Design Review.

Mr. Cooper mentioned that at the next meeting, on April 25, 2002, the Board would consider APP 2002-0003 – Sunset High School Site and Parking Lot Appeal, observing that this appeal of BDR 2001-0212 – Sunset High School Site and Parking Lot Design Review involves Washington County's appeal that specifically addresses safety concerns with regard to access onto NW Science Park Drive from NW Cornell Road.

Referring to the meeting scheduled for May 9, 2002, Mr. Cooper briefly discussed these applications, which include the continuance of BDR 2001-0213 – Beaverton High School Cafeteria Design Review, BDR 2002-0003 – Panda Express Design Review, and BDR 2002-0013 – Prince of Peace Lutheran Church Design Review.

Chairman Straus pointed out that he might not be available for the next meeting on April 25, 2002.

Observing that it might be necessary to disqualify himself from participating in the decision with regard to APP 2002-0003 – Sunset High School Site and Parking Lot Appeal, Mr. Beighley requested clarification of whether he would still be allowed to chair this meeting, in the absence of Chairman Straus.

Mr. Cooper noted that he believes that the By-Laws would allow Mr. Beighley to chair this meeting, adding that he would be present in order to provide a quorum, after which he would recuse himself from participating with regard to that specific application.

The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.